

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 27 2006

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the office action, claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-16, 18-24 and 26 -58 were pending and rejected.

In this response, no claim has been canceled or amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-16, 18-24, 26 and 32-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,392,671 to Glaser ("Glaser"). It is respectfully submitted that the present invention as claimed includes limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by Glaser.

Specifically, for example, independent claim 1 includes limitations of retrieving a data value representing an appearance of an enclosure enclosing a data processing system including a microprocessor of the system, where the data value includes a value representing at least one of a machine type and a color of the enclosure of the data processing system. Thereafter, an appearance of a display of the data processing system is determined based on the appearance of the enclosure of the data processing system using the data value.

That is, an appearance of a display of a computer (e.g., desktop scheme) may be determined based on a data value representing an appearance of an enclosure (e.g., chassis) of the computer including the microprocessor (e.g., CPU) of the computer. The data value also indicates the machine type and/or color of the enclosure of the computer including enclosing a microprocessor of the computer. It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are absent from Glaser.

Rather, Glaser discloses selecting a desktop scheme of a computer based on a type of a pointing device (e.g., mouse) plugged into the computer, such as mechanical and/or electrical features of the pointing device, rather than an enclosure (e.g., chassis) of the computer.

Specifically, Glaser states:

"Further in accordance with the present invention, mouse 30 includes identification means 35, which can be, for example, a semiconductor memory, DIP switch package, or a hardwired structure. Identification means 35 carries a unique identifier sufficient to identify to a computer system each unique individual mouse 30 that is connected to the microprocessor unit 1."

(Glaser, col. 5, lines 27-37, emphasis added)

Thus, the desktop scheme of Glaser is determined based on a type of the mouse, where the mouse includes an identification means which is implemented in a mechanical and/or electrical manner (e.g., hardwired structure) as described above. It is respectfully submitted that the desktop scheme of Glaser is not based on an enclosure of the mouse and definitely not based on an enclosure enclosing the computer, including its microprocessor (e.g., CPU). There is no suggestion for such purposes within Glaser.

Although the Office Action admitted that a mouse is "a part of" a computer, nevertheless, the Office Action insisted that a mouse includes a microprocessor (see, 8/30/2006 Office Action, pp. 2-3). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

It is respectfully submitted that a mouse is not a computer and certainly does not include a microprocessor such as a CPU of a computer. If a mouse were considered as a computer, Glaser's computer system includes another computer system. It is respectfully submitted that one with ordinary skill in the art would not consider a mouse as a computer.

Even if, for the sake of arguments, a mouse may be considered as a computer, the desktop scheme of Glaser does not depend on the enclosure of the mouse for the reasons set forth above. It is respectfully submitted that nowhere in Glaser discloses or suggests the limitations set forth above as claimed in the present application.

In order render a claim obvious, each and every limitations of the claim must be disclosed by Glaser. For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that Glaser fails to

disclose or suggest each and every limitations of claim 1, and therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Glaser.

Similarly, independent claims 10, 16, 32, 41, 47, 50, and 58 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 10, 16, 32, 41, 47, 50, and 58 are not anticipated by Glaser.

Given that the rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are not anticipated by Glaser. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: November 27, 2006


Kevin G. Shao
Reg. No. 45,095

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300